

REMARKS

This communication is in response to Office Action mailed Nov. 22, 2004, having a shortened three-month statutory period for response. While an extension of time is not deemed necessary, the Office is requested and hereby authorized to charge the appropriate extension-of-time fees against Account No. 04-1679 to Duane Morris LLP.

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 4 for containing various informalities. Accordingly, claim 4 has been amended to address the Examiner's objections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the formal objections are respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection

Claims 1-17 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Patent No. 4,806,888 to Salvage. Applicant respectfully disagrees with grounds of this rejection.

As discussed in the background section, the conventional power detection systems employed diode detectors to accomplish power detection. The limitations of the diode detectors render such devices inefficient and costly particularly when used with very high frequency (VHF) signals. Applicant's disclosure provides a novel power detector which utilizes one or more passive attenuators to provide a dynamic power range responsive to both high and low signal powers. To this end, each independent claim is directed to power detector, or a method for power detection, which sample the output signal and, using the passive attenuator(s) produces a control signal proportional to the transmitted power level.

For example, claim 1 recites a power detector for a radio frequency wireless communication transmitter with a controllable transmitted power with cascaded elements

that are *passive*. Moreover and with respect to independent claim 4, Salvage fails to disclose or suggest “plural diode detectors” as claimed. Similarly and with respect to independent claim 12, the reference fails to disclose or suggest “a unidirectional circuit for detecting a characteristic of each of the plural power level signals.” With respect to independent claim 13, the reference fails to disclose or suggest that power division “is accomplished using only passive circuit elements.” With respect to independent claim 14 (as amended), the reference fails to disclose or suggest “attenuating the power level signal with a successive cascade of passive attenuators to thereby provide a plurality of attenuator signals.” Finally, with respect to independent claim 17, the reference fails to disclose or suggest “the sampled signal is divided prior to detection without using active circuit elements.” Similarly, each of the independent claims 4, 11-14 and 17 recite a similar feature.

Salvage fails to disclose or suggest, among others, attenuators in the form of cascaded elements where each element is a passive device. Referring to Fig. 1, the reference shows a complex weighting circuit having all pass network 12, phase generators 16 and 17, attenuators 31-34 and summer 30. At col. 3, lines 39-44, Salvage discloses “a pair of cascaded dual gate field effect transistors connected in the manner shown in FIG. 4.” The examiner has admitted during the interview that a FET is not a passive element, thus Claims 1, 4, 11-14 and 17 are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 5-10 and 15-16 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the above-discussed independent claims and are deemed patentable by the virtue of their dependence. Accordingly, additional reason for patentability of each claim will not be discussed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 1-17 over
Salvage are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois	Reg. No. 46,285
L. Lawton Rogers, III	Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English	Reg. No. 42,514
Patrick D. McPherson	Reg. No. 46,255

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: February 22, 2005

WSH\122158.1